

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application. Applicants acknowledge that the rejection of claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) has been withdrawn, however, new grounds of rejection have been made by the Examiner. Therefore, claims 1-31 stand rejected.

In the present Office Action dated March 15, 2007, the Examiner relies on ***Kiang*** (US 6,453,151), in combination with various other references, to reject all of the pending claims. However, because ***Kiang***, either alone or in combination with the other references, fails to disclose one or more of the claimed features of all of the independent claims, the Applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are allowable for reasons presented below.

Claim 1 is discussed first. Claim 1 calls for receiving a request from a remote unit to provide a power level associated with a transmitting component. With respect to this claimed feature, the Examiner asserts that the “remote unit” of claim 1 corresponds to the base station controller (BSC) 102 of ***Kiang***, and the “transmitting component” of claim 1 corresponds to the mobile station (MS) 106 of ***Kiang***.

Claim 1 further calls for measuring a power level of a signal provided by the transmitting component in response to receiving the request from the remote unit. The Examiner asserts this claimed feature is taught by ***Kiang*** because ***Kiang*** teaches that MS 106 (“transmitting component,” according to the Examiner) measures “the received signal strength by using the amplitude values of the pilot bits” transmitted to the MS 106 in the pilot channel. *See* Office Action, p. 3. The Applicants respectfully disagree that ***Kiang*** discloses this claimed feature. As noted, claim 1 calls for measuring a power level of a signal provided by the transmitting component. In contrast, ***Kiang*** discloses that MS 106 determines the signal strength of the received signal (based on the pilots bits in the pilot channel), and not the power level of a signal

that is provided by MS 106. The other cited references also fail to teach this claimed feature. For this reason alone, claim 1, and its dependent claims, is allowable. Additionally, independent claims 11, 17, 25, and 31 (and any claims depending therefrom) are allowable for at least one or more reasons presented above.

Arguments with respect to other dependent claims have been noted. However, in view of the aforementioned arguments, these arguments are moot and, therefore, not specifically addressed. To the extent that characterization of the prior art references or Applicants' claimed subject matter are not specifically addressed, it is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to such characterization.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4064 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON
CUSTOMER NO. 46290

Date: June 15, 2007

/Ruben S. Bains/
Ruben S. Bains
Reg. No. 46,532
10333 Richmond Dr., Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-4064
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS